

Date: Tue, 23 Feb 93 04:30:19 PST  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #47  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Tue, 23 Feb 93                      Volume 93 : Issue    47

Today's Topics:

    Eliminate the Written Exam (5 msgs)  
    Existing No-Exam services

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: 22 Feb 1993 14:16:43 GMT  
From: usc!cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!chnews!joshua!jbromley@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Eliminate the Written Exam  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <C2txtB.B0v@news.Hawaii.Edu> tony@mpg.phys.hawaii.edu (Antonio  
Querubin) writes:

>  
>So you do accept that some of the readership will detect sarcasm and some  
>will not? So take those two groups and ask yourself whether the original note  
>had the intended 'sarcastic' effect the author intended.

>  
    [some stuff deleted]

>  
>The bottom line is that one communicate ideas/thoughts to others. In this  
>instance, I would assert that 'sarcasm' was lost on the audience and  
>was therefore ineffective. You said earlier that you expect readers to read  
>through a message giving it thoughtful consideration. It wouldn't be unfair  
>to expect message writers to do the same before posting. Otherwise we have a  
>fundamental failure in communication.

>

SARCASM MODE: 0.25\_SERIOUS

Geez, maybe we ought to license Usenet news junkies. Require them to copy sarcasm at 25 wpm (min.) and send flamage at 5 wpm (max.). It would might reduce spurious emissions and interference to "important" services. Obligatory smiley follows - :-)

```
+-----+-----+
| Jim Bromley W5GYJ          |                               |
| Chandler,AZ 85226          | Celebrating 30 years as a No-Code Technician |
| tel: 602-554-5183         | Internet: jlbromley@sedona.intel.com         |
+-----+-----+
```

-----  
Date: 22 Feb 93 16:54:36 GMT  
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu  
Subject: Eliminate the Written Exam  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

AL N1AL said:

Now the son is a Novice and the father a no-code Tech. They can't talk to each other on the air!

I say:

But they can! On 220 or 1280MHz. They just need a couple of 220 handhelds and they'd be fine.

But the point of you article is well taken. There should be more than one entry level into ham radio Though Tech is most popular a Novice equivalent is necessary. Novice testing should have stayed in the ham community not be placed with the VECs. The bogus argument of incorrectly filled forms could be dealt with with a CLEARER form.

Another example of the "Balkanisation of amateur radio" -- "This is my bit and you can have this bit, and sod the rest of you".

Kevin Purcell N7WIM / G8UDP  
a-kevinp@microsoft.com  
"We conjure the spirits of the computer with our spells"

-----  
Date: 22 Feb 1993 17:21:36 GMT  
From: ucsd.edu!brian@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: Eliminate the Written Exam  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

jbloom@arrl.org (Jon Bloom) writes:

>Gee, I guess the bottom line is that it's OK to use profanity here but  
>it's not OK to use sarcasm. What a strange place is Usenet!

Actually, it's OK to use both. But using sarcasm is like casting pearls  
before swine: a goodly number of readers won't know what to do with it.

My growing opinion of the public is that we will have to communicate  
with comic books if we really want them to understand. I'm yet to be  
convinced that most hams exceed that level.

Feh.

- Brian

-----  
Date: 22 Feb 93 21:23:57 GMT  
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu  
Subject: Eliminate the Written Exam  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Someone (Gary ke4zv?) said:

It's all about interference, not laziness. Filters are a ham myth.

I say:

I agree on all your sentiments but this one.

The ARRL certainly believes in the examination procedure as a filtering  
systems. How else can one explain the "incentive" licensing system and  
the multitude of license classes we have today? Filters are not a myth,  
but are a construct of a certain group of amateurs who exerted control  
over the hobby.

Remember the FCC said they'd change the rules if a "sufficient" number  
of people wanted the rules changed. Half of the licensed hams today are  
novices and techs and the numbers are growing ...

Kevin Purcell N7WIM / G8UDP  
a-kevinp@microsoft.com

"We conjure the spirits of the computer with our spells"

-----

Date: 23 Feb 1993 01:37:02 GMT  
From: topaz.bds.com!topaz.bds.com!ron@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Eliminate the Written Exam  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

> Novice testing should have stayed in the ham  
> community not be placed with the VECs.

It still is. While the rule change has been proposed, it isn't official yet. While I don't care much for putting the novice under the VEC program, I spent some time talking to the League about this. It's not their direct doing. The FCC is going to dump the direct novice testing (not only is it incorrectly filled out 610's but it's a big source of Fraud). ARRL and W5YI decided to file for it so they could get the rules made on their terms (primarily allowing generals to provide novice tests).

-Ron

-----  
Date: Mon, 22 Feb 93 15:31:41 GMT  
From: usc!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!orchard.la.locus.com!prodnet.la.locus.com!  
lando.la.locus.com!dana@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Existing No-Exam services  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

There are already existing a number of No-Code, No-Exam services in the US. These services permit business communications, too. There's GMRS, which is trivial to get a license for, simply fill out a form and send \$35 to the FCC. In my area, there are at least three high level GMRS repeaters which cost very little to be members of.

27Mhz CB is available, radios are extremely cheap, but range is limited. No licenses or fees required.

There's conventional business band communications; you can buy or lease radios, fill out a form, and pay something like \$50 to \$150 to get on the air. As trunked systems become prevalent, you end up buying or leasing trunked radios and paying a small monthly fee to the operator of a trunked repeater.

Then there's the cellular telephone service. The radios are very cheap, the monthly service is somewhat pricey, but you can't beat the convenience.

--

\* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are \*

\* (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily \*

\* dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer

\*

\* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests \*

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #47

\*\*\*\*\*